DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 119 JC 720 181

AUTHOR Brawer, Florence B.; Purdy, Leslie
TITLE Faculty Evaluation Workshop For Community College Deans of Instruction.
PUB DATE Jun 72
NOTE 6p.; Report of a workshop coordinated by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges and held at the University of California, Los Angeles, June 27-28, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; *Behavioral Objectives; *College Deans; Course Objectives; *Evaluation Criteria; Faculty Evaluation; *Junior Colleges; Role Playing; Self Evaluation; *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

A workshop for community college deans of instruction focused on evaluating faculty in California community colleges. Eight major concerns of faculty regarding their evaluation were discussed with emphasis on the positive aspects of evaluation. The use of simulations provided workshop participants with the opportunity to assume roles of deans of instruction, colleagues, department chairmen, and candidates for faculty positions. Golden West College's (California) Assessment of Student Learning (ASL) system was presented as one model for faculty evaluation. The ASL system, which stresses faculty use of specific or behavioral objectives in course planning, was discussed in terms of its advantages to faculty members and the college. Conclusions of the workshop include: (1) an evaluation scheme should be based on definite performance criteria; (2) deans themselves should become aware of the use of objectives and faculty self-evaluation; (3) the problem of evaluating faculty who do not use objectives was not resolved by the participating deans; (4) the use of simulation appeared a successful way of bringing out problems and underlying concerns; and (5) the participants felt that the workshop was beneficial and should be followed-up with additional meetings. (RG)

ED 065119

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FACULTY EVALUATION WORKSHOP FOR

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DEANS OF INSTRUCTION

Coordinated by ERIC Clearinghouse For Junior Colleges
University of California, Los Angeles
June 27-28, 1972

Proceedings of the workshop authored by:

Florence B. Brawer and
Leslie Purdy

Facilitators

Florence B. Brawer
Arthur M. Cohen
Leslie Purdy
William Shawl

JC 720 181

Focusing on evaluation of faculty in California community colleges, a workshop was held June 27 and 28 at UCLA. Participants included deans of instruction from eleven California community colleges and two administrators from the Kansas City (Mo.) Community College District.

This paper summarizes the workshop proceedings under four headings: Concerns, Simulations, a Model of Faculty Self-Evaluation, and Conclusions.

CONCERNS

Eight general issues relating to faculty evaluation represented the major concerns of the participants:

1. The relationship between the basic purposes of evaluation and the evaluation system developed by a college.

2. Faculty attitudes toward evaluation. In many cases, an element of threat appears; the faculty are fearful, and the whole matter of evaluation is surrounded by a negative aura.

3. Variations in evaluation procedures among older, established schools and newer, more innovative institutions.

4. The dean's role as facilitator versus his role as evaluator. Is there a contradiction between the roles?

5. The importance of the initial faculty selection interview in setting the scene for subsequent evaluation. What types of questions should be asked by a candidate for a teaching position? What should be asked by the interviewers, how much information should be given on both sides, and finally, what is the instructional orientation of the faculty member--does he see himself as a facilitator of learning?

6. Types of faculty evaluation--peer, student, administrative, staff, self. Which scheme should be employed, or is the most reliable procedure a combination of all four? If the latter, do the opinions of one group of evaluators take precedence over others?

7. The purposes of evaluation. Is the procedure one that is really head-hunting or can it lead to the improvement of instruction? Is the California faculty evaluation bill--Senate Bill #696--merely a law on paper that a college tries to get around or is it to be, indeed, a law that will lead to instructional improvement?

8. Criteria on which the instructor is evaluated, the value of job descriptions, and elucidation of responsibilities for faculties and administrative staffs. Adequate job descriptions appear to be a necessity so that responsibilities are specifically spelled out and assessment is made on the basis of definite criteria.

In response to the anxiety of faculty regarding evaluation, a discussion was held emphasizing its positive side. An effective evaluation scheme provides a job description that adequately represents the instructor's responsibilities and builds review procedures that are agreed upon by the faculty member. Certain provisions within the state bill protect by explicating faculty rights for appeal. And further, a sense of threat is reduced if evaluation papers stay within the evaluation file and are not transmitted to the placement office where they might be used either for or against the faculty member. In cases where the faculty member is suspect and there is a demand to dismiss him--a situation that, despite the amount of concern about it is actually quite rare in all institutions--the dean then may call upon a special committee to reassess the instructor in question.

SIMULATIONS

Workshop participants were randomly selected to assume various roles in three simulations--dean of instruction, colleague, department chairman, and candidate for a faculty position. The first two simulations were of interviews of prospective faculty members for a community college position. The third simulation was of a conference following the visitations of a faculty member's class by a dean, division chairman and faculty peer. A fourth and relatively spontaneous simulation focused on the creation of measurable objectives for affective and somewhat ambiguous materials.

These simulations provoked discussion on the part of both participants and facilitators:

Initial Interview

Contradictory ideas were expressed about the purpose of the selection interview. Is its intent to scare a prospective faculty member? Is it to convey information? If so, how much?

The interviewers tended to be more anxious to get information from the prospective faculty member than they were to inform him about the school's policies or philosophies. Rather than an honest exchange of information occuring, participants spent more time in maneuvering around each other. Some interviewers used trick questions or tried to catch the candidate off guard. And such maneuvers tended to put him on the defensive and gave a negative tone to the interview. The employment interview can influence the relationship between the Dean of Instruction and a new faculty member for at least a year or more. Thus, if this initial interview is one that is basically negative or fear-producing, then the new faculty member cannot be expected to trust and confide in the Dean of Instruction about the problems he is having in his classroom.

Few questions were asked about instruction, the teacher's objectives and/or goals, and the school's expectations of their faculty members. Also omitted from this discussion were such questions as: What are you going to teach? How will you know it when you see it? How are you going to measure it?

Some schools have only a 10 or 15 minute interview with the candidate and in such a limited amount of time, very little information can be exchanged and only vague general impressions can be formulated. Other schools report an extensive interview situation where the prospective faculty member supplies a description of courses that he has taught and/or the actual specific learning objectives that he has used. In this way the interviewers get ideas about the teaching philosophy of the candidate. If specifics about the school's philosophy are not expressed in the initial interview, it is doubtful that they will be discussed before he is hired. Thus, the initial interview is a very important part of the faculty evaluation processes.

Questions came up about the dean's involvement in the selection of faculty members. Should he be involved in the pre-interview screening? If a division does all the screening of prospective candidates, are they likely to pick people who are similar to them in philosophy? If the dean is interested in introducing new ideas and new instructional methods, he may have to participate in the screening process as well as in the final interview stage.

Evaluation Conference

In a simulation of an evaluation conference, the evaluator tried to put the faculty member at ease by mentioning a good student rating. However, the conversation still appeared stilted and uncomfortable to the observers. Only a slight allusion was made to behavioral objectives and the role playing narrowed down to a "them versus us" situation--faculty versus administration.

Participants were divided as to the value of visitation as an evaluation device. Positive effects sometimes stem from visitation because the faculty member can feel that the dean of the college cares about what he is doing and is interested enough to take time to look. However, interest can be shown in other ways and visitation may not be the most effective means for evaluation. Some participants favored a post-visitation conference between the dean and faculty member only.

Both visitation and other evaluation schemes protect the faculty and provide useful information. On the other hand, it is not necessary to visit a class because time spent in such observations can be better spent elsewhere, and the dean can get as much information from student rating forms as from visiting a classroom. Is it worth as much to get one person looking at a faculty member as it is to get 150 pairs of eyes appraising him through a student evaluation form?

Developing Course Objectives

The last simulation tied the writing of specific learning objectives to evaluation. It was a demonstration of the way very vague goals that superficially appear unmeasurable (a freshman English Lit course) could be translated into measurable objectives. The simulation revealed that a wide range of material can be put into measurable terms and that subjective, as well as objective criteria are valid in assessing student performance.

This simulation also demonstrated that the dean of instruction can be more actively involved in the progress of the faculty. In translating into concrete terms, in understanding, and in accepting the faculty member's objectives, the dean can demonstrate flexibility, can provide a genuine helping relationship, and can act as a facilitator of learning rather than an evaluator of an instructor.

THE MODEL

A model for faculty evaluation on bases other than visitation is provided by the Golden West College's Assessment of Student Learning or "ASL" system. Since faculty use of specific or behavioral objectives is central to the ASL scheme, the workshop participants first raised questions about objectives and voiced their doubts and negative feelings about them. For example--Would the use of objectives eliminate the joy and love for learning that seem to come from exposure to a great teacher? Do they preclude spontaneity in the classroom? In response, it was suggested that if a teacher knows where he's going and has a certain set of objectives that form the minimal basis of course structure, then more freedom and spontaneity can result than when a course is completely unstructured and goalless. Furthermore, most teachers are not great ones; the majority can well benefit from clearly stated course objectives and teaching from them.

With a six year history, the Golden West scheme of faculty evaluation is unique in several respects--one of which is its self-selection element. A faculty member can select the more traditional visitation means of evaluation or the ASL approach. Approximately 50% of the faculty are in the ASL system and none has returned to the more traditional form of evaluation.

The ASL system includes preliminary discussion between the dean, faculty member and division chairman of the statements of purposes and presentation of plans for instruction--including class plans built on objectives. Follow-up meetings are arranged at least once each year. At this time, data--in the form of evidence of student learning--are brought in by faculty to substantiate achievement. Objectives are reviewed and sometimes revised. At this second session, the dean and faculty member can: focus on the objectives to see that they are clear; examine the media that have been employed to achieve those objectives; and appraise the testing procedures to see whether or not the students are able to meet the objectives as indicated.

The ASL has certain advantages for faculty members and for the college: (1) Faculty are evaluated on the basis of their own goals, objectives and other criteria of success, not those imposed on them; (2) By his participation in the ASL scheme, the faculty members have more exact information on student learning and can therefore feel more secure in their roles; (3) Many faculty volunteer for the ASL system because they do not like having deans come into their classrooms and are uncomfortable with visitation by peers; (4) The dean and the division chairman are able to see the course in total, not just a one-day segment of it. Consequently, they are more in touch with what is going on on the campus than if they visited each course once a semester. On the other hand, the autonomy of the instructor is also recognized and respected; (5) During the ASL conference, the dean finds out what kinds of help the instructors need; for instance, what additional laboratory space, travel grants, or time off, he might require. The dean and the division chairman can then work together to give help to an instructor who needs it; (6) The use of objectives leads to greater flexibility in course arrangement. For example, a course that is put into an objectives format can be broken up into smaller units (mini-courses); when the student completes a certain number of objectives, he receives one unit of credit.

In discussing ASL, a distinction was made between the management of instruction and the management of instructors; i.e., the attempt to manipulate the instructor versus the appraisal of instruction in terms of student learning. It is easier and more feasible to deal with the process of instruction than to try to change the personality of the instructor. In the initial interview situation, for example, if the candidate presents his course syllabus and list of objectives, emphasis can be placed on the instructional process rather than the instructor. Likewise, in the second ASL conference between the dean and a faculty member, emphasis is on

student learning, not the faculty member's personal characteristics. The ASL fosters cooperation between the dean and the instructor to further student learning rather than place the dean and faculty in an adverse relationship.

IMPRESSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE WORKSHOP

1. Predetermined lists of responsibilities and criteria for staff and faculty members are necessary for an evaluation scheme. If a faculty member does not know the basis on which he is being evaluated, he has a right to be fearful. On the other hand, if definite criteria are established, then less anxiety and insecurity develop.

2. An overall evaluation of the workshop by the participants indicated that the deans themselves became more aware of the use of objectives and of faculty self-evaluation as a crux of the institution's faculty evaluation plan.

3. The participating deans did not resolve the problem of how to evaluate faculty who do not use objectives. Some identified the additional problem of how they might assist faculty to use objectives.

4. Simulations--The use of simulation or role playing seemed to be a successful way of bringing out problems and underlying concerns. The simulations could have been improved, however, by allowing participants to volunteer for roles rather than being randomly selected.

5. Workshop participants suggested that a follow-up procedure occur in the form of future workshops, questionnaires about changed practices, and provision of written materials about current faculty evaluation practices.

6. Some of the deans wished that the meeting could have been extended. A desire for further discussion of the ASL system and how it could be implemented, either in total or in part at other schools, was indicated.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 6 1972

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION